

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's thorough consideration provided the present application. Claims 1-14 are now present in the application. Claims 1 and 9 are independent. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-5, 8, 9 and 11-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Humpleman et al. (referred to herein as Humpleman), U.S. Patent No. 6,182,094. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

As the Examiner will note, independent claim 1 recites a combination of steps including "displaying the second menu image on said display device in place of the first menu image previously displayed on said display device, the second menu image being displayed without performing an additional image construction process". Independent claim 9 recites a combination of steps including "displaying the second menu image on said display device to replace the first menu image previously displayed on said display device, the second menu image being displayed without performing an additional image construction process".

Applicants respectfully submit that the combinations of steps set forth in claims 1 and 9 are not disclosed or suggested by the reference relied on by the Examiner.

Humpleman discloses a method and system for generating a program guide for a home network (see Abstract). As shown in FIG. 10 of Humpleman, the top-level home page 804 (referred to by the Examiner as the second image) is displayed on the display device simultaneously with the device link page 710 (referred to by the Examiner as the first menu image). Therefore, Humpleman fails to teach “displaying the second menu image on said display device in place of (for claim 1)/to replace (for claim 9) the first menu image previously displayed on said display device” as recited in claims 1 and 9. Although the Examiner asserted on page 1 of the last Office Action that Humpleman in col. 13, lines 30-67 allows a user to link the device back to its home page and download a user interface from the home page for that particular device, the Examiner’s assertion still fails to show the replacement of the first menu image with the second menu image. In fact, Humpleman merely teaches if the user selects a particular home device button, the respective device’s home page is subsequently displayed to the user (see col. 13, lines 35-38). Humpleman does not teach that the subsequently displayed device’s home page will replace the device link page.

In the alternative, Humpleman fails to teach “the second menu image being displayed without performing an additional image construction process” as recited in claims 1 and 9. Although the Examiner asserts that Humpleman in col. 15, lines 63-65 teaches the above recitation in claims 1 and 9, Applicants respectfully disagree. Humpleman in col. 15, lines 63-65 merely teaches that the session manger obtains the particular capabilities of a selected home device by accessing a standard named file, which includes the standard named functions such as “accepting video” and “display video”, on the respective home device. However, displaying the standard named functions to be a single menu image by using the standard named file must require performing an additional image construction process. Without performing an additional image construction process, it is impossible to convert the standard named functions in the standard named file to a single menu image displayed on the display device. Therefore, Humpleman fails to teach the above recitation in claims 1 and 9.

Since Humpleman fails to teach each and every recitation of independent claims 1 and 9, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 9 are not anticipated by Humpleman.

In addition, claims 2-5, 8 and 11-14 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1 and 9, and are therefore allowable based on their respective dependence from independent claims 1 and 9.

In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-5, 8, 9 and 11-14 clearly define the present invention over the reference relied on by the Examiner. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 6, 7 and 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Humpleman in view of Kim, U.S. Patent No. 6,133,911. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

As mentioned, Humpleman fails to teach each and every recitation of independent claims 1 and 9.

With regard to the Examiner's reliance on Kim, this reference has only been relied on for its teachings related to the subject matter of dependent claims 6, 7 and 10. This reference also fails to disclose the above combinations of elements as set forth in independent claims 1 and 9. Accordingly, this reference fails to cure the deficiencies of Humpleman.

Accordingly, neither Humpleman nor Kim, individually or in combination, teaches or suggests at least the above-noted features of

independent claims 1 and 9. Therefore, claims 6, 7 and 10 are allowable based on their respective dependence from independent claims 1 and 9.

In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 6, 7 and 10 clearly define the present invention over the references relied on by the Examiner. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

All the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed and/or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently pending rejections and that they be withdrawn.

It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and that as such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to send the application to Issue.

In the event that the present Reply does not place the application in condition for allowance, please contact the undersigned at (703) 205-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area to schedule an interview.

Application No.: 09/748,250
Art Unit: 2174

Attorney Docket No. 2590-0181P
Reply filed March 2, 2005
Page 7

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By Esther H. Chong
Esther H. Chong
Reg. No. 40,953

EHC/GH/mmi/asc

6/8

P. O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000